

REMARKS

In the July 1, 2008 Office Action, claims 1 and 2 stand rejected in view of prior art. Also, claims 3, 6, 9 and 10 were rejected for failing to indicate and claim particularly and distinctly the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. On the other hand, claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the July 1, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 as indicated above. Also, Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 2. Thus, claims 3-10 are now pending, with claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 3, 6, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 6 to overcome this rejection. Claims 3 and 6 have also been rewritten in independent form because Applicants believe that the arrangements of these claims, if properly construed and understood, are not disclosed in the Inoue et al. publication or any other prior art of record.

Specifically, claims 3 and 6 now require the wind direction of the air current blown out from each of said main outlets being variable within an angular range relative to a lower surface of a ceiling to which the air conditioner is mounted, the angular range being defined between a first direction inclined a first angular amount relative to the lower surface and a second direction inclined a second angular amount relative to the lower surface, and that the fixed direction is being substantially equally angularly spaced from the first and second directions such that the fixed a vertical blow out direction is of the air that is a direction of substantially in a middle of the angular [[a]] range within by which the wind direction of the air current blown out from each of said main outlets is variable each of said horizontal flaps vertically regulate the wind direction of the air current blown out from each of said main

outlets. This arrangement can be understood from Figures 5 and 6, and pages 8-10 of the specification of the instant application where the air flow directions **X** and **Y** and their angular orientations (i.e., the range of $\beta_1-\beta_2$ and γ) relative to the lower surface of the ceiling **U** are explained.

Claims 9 and 10 are believed to be rejected under this section merely for their dependence on claim 3 as indicated in the Office Action, and thus, are not being amended. Therefore, Applicants believe that claims 3, 6, 9 and 10 now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe the arrangement of the variable range of airflow directions of the main outlets and the fixed airflow direction of the fixed outlet, as now set forth in these claims, are not disclosed or suggested by the Inoue et al. publication or any other prior art of record. Accordingly, Claims 3, 6, 9 and 10 are now believed to be allowable.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 4-64041 (Inoue et al.). In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 2. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 7 to place them in independent form, to accept the allowable subject matter. Thus, independent claims 4 and 7 as well as dependent claims 5 and 8, which depend from claims 4 and 7, respectively, are believed to be allowable.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

Appl. No. 10/553,234
Amendment dated September 18, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2008

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-10 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Hilsmier/
Patrick A. Hilsmier
Reg. No. 46,034

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444

Dated: September 18, 2008

S:\09-SEP08-YTY\DK-US030723 Amendment.doc